



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

33

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	INDEX	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	R	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/822,778	03/21/97				976148

RICHARD E HAFERKAMP
HOWELL & HAFERKAMP
7733 FORSYTH BOULEVARD
SUITE 1400
ST LOUIS MO 63105

LM02/0928

KLIMOWICZ, EXAMINER

2754ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
--------------	--------------

09/28/98

9

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

See attachments

Interview Summary

Application No.

08/822,778

Applicant(s)

Index

Examiner

William J. Klimowicz

Group Art Unit

2754



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) William J. Klimowicz

(3) _____

(2) Michael Thomas (for Applicant)

(4) _____

Date of Interview Sep 25, 1998Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: claims of record

Identification of prior art discussed:

Jeffers (US 4,908,724)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to modify the magnetic head of Jeffers (US 4,908,724) into a "thin film" magnetic head, although agreeing that there is an art recognized motivation for doing so (e.g., mass production of heads driving down costs), the resulting head structure would not result in the claimed invention. The Examiner maintains that the only difference between THE CLAIMED INVENTION and Jeffers (US 4,908,724) is the fact that the claimed invention recites a "thin film" head while Jeffers (US 4,908,724) appears to only show a "core-type" head. The Examiner maintains that not only is there motivation in the art for producing thin-film heads (Applicant has concurred), but that the modification of Jeffers (US 4,908,724) to thin film technology would result in the structure as recited in the invention AS CURRENTLY CLAIMED. The Examiner suggested language that may define over the head of Jeffers (US 4,908,724) as applied to thin film technology. No agreement was reached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

WILLIAM J. KLIMOWICZ
PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2754

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.